



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,940	11/29/2001	Holger Nolte	CRR0001	8873

7590

09/21/2005

KENNETH J. SHEEHAN, BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
WASHINGTON SQUARE, SUITE 1100
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5304

EXAMINER

BAYERL, RAYMOND J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/001,940	Applicant(s) NOLTE ET AL.	
	Examiner Raymond J. Bayerl	Art Unit 2173	

PTOL 303 - page 1/3

PA

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): objections made to claims 2, 12, 16 - 21, 33.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1 - 38.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER


11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The combination of Iwamura et al. (US #5,945,976)'s 3-dimensional object rendering with the color and item buffering applied across a region of pixels to identify objects in Montgomery et al. (US #5,696,533) is sufficient to render the claims obvious under 35 USC 103. For each pixel in the finally-displayed image, Montgomery et al. assigns an item value. This form of pixel-by-pixel indexing is advantageous in the 3-dimensional object scenario of Iwamura et al., since this will allow Iwamura et al.'s objects to be properly referenced, once they've been readied for the final 2-dimensional display. The Montgomery et al. disclosure is of maintaining both color values and item numbers across the pixels of the image, so that each pixel has its appropriate mapping. This is sufficient to read upon applicant's actual, broadly-recited claims. The Examiner is not attempting a literal combination of the entire buffering arrangements of both Iwamura et al. and Montgomery et al., but the teachings of the concepts of 3-dimensional rendering (Iwamura et al.) and item buffering (Montgomery et al.), as they are applicable to these broad claims. Thus, it does not matter that z-buffering may have been employed in a system like Iwamura et al., since it is the result of image data in two dimensions that then benefits from the use of Montgomery et al.'s joint buffering of color and items--regardless of Montgomery et al.'s possibly suggesting its own form of initial buffering. Also, the identical Montgomery et al. disclosure of a two-dimensional system is still applicable to Iwamura et al., since Iwamura et al.'s 3-dimensional space must be converted to two dimensions, prior to display.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20050919


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

19 September 2005